

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-14, 23, 24, 28-31, 34-36, 45-47 and 49 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49 are independent. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 1-2, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 23-24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 45-47 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,195,090 to Riggins, III (hereinafter, merely “Riggins”).

Claims 8, 14, 30 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Riggins in view of US 2005/0198668 A1 to Yuen, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yuen”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A digital broadcast signal processing apparatus comprising:...

a multiplex processing section for multiplexing on a digital broadcast signal of [a] corresponding program GPS position information received from the movable body **and GPS position information received from an imaging apparatus that is operable to acquire imaging area information concerning the**

corresponding program and is disposed mechanically independent of a movable body that is an object in the corresponding program. [Emphasis added.]

As understood by Applicants, Riggins relates to an interactive sporting event monitoring system which includes a determiner for determining whether video blanking interval data is present in a selected television channel and a decoder for decoding video blanking interval data from the selected television channel. The interactive sporting event monitoring system further includes a user input for accepting a user-specified channel identifier from a user, and a monitor for placing the channel of sporting-event audio information that the user desires to monitor in a format to facilitate monitoring thereof by a user. The video blanking interval data may further include telemetry data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Riggins does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Riggins does not teach or suggest a digital broadcast signal processing apparatus comprising a multiplex processing section for multiplexing on a digital broadcast signal of a corresponding program (i) GPS position information received from the movable body and (ii) GPS position information received from an imaging apparatus that is operable to acquire imaging area information concerning the corresponding program and is disposed mechanically independent of a movable body that is an object in the corresponding program, as recited in independent claim 1.

Riggins discusses global position system (“GPS”) information being received by each race car in an automobile racing event, and the telemetry data transmitted from the race car comprising position data. *See, e.g.*, column 3, lines 6-17; column 5, lines 8-37. Riggins further notes that in “sporting events where event participants do not have radio-linked teams, the telemetry data transmissions . . . can comprise only images or information *seen or perceivable by the event participant during the sporting event.*” Column 5, lines 19-24 (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither such GPS information from the race car nor such images or information seen or perceivable by the event participant, as discussed in Riggins, teaches or suggests “GPS position information received from an imaging apparatus that is operable to acquire imaging area information concerning the corresponding program and is disposed mechanically independent of a movable body that is an object in the corresponding program,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Riggins also states at column 9, line 50, that “telemetry data includes parametric data from automobile engines, contestants, etc.” On column 9, line 60, in connection with an automobile racing event, Riggins further states that “telemetry data can be treated as either alpha-numeric information or graphic information.” As understood by applicants, even though the telemetry data transmitted by an automobile can be treated as alpha-numeric information or graphic information, it is merely statistical information and does not comprise video information acquired by an imaging apparatus. And, even assuming *arguendo* that Riggins were to describe telemetry data transmitted from an automobile comprising video information acquired by an imaging apparatus (which Applicants maintain Riggins does not), Riggins nevertheless does not teach or suggest “GPS position information received from an imaging apparatus that is operable to acquire imaging area information concerning the corresponding program and is disposed mechanically independent of a movable body that is an object in the corresponding program,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Riggins also discusses generating a near video quality three-dimensional model of the actual racetrack:

A near video quality three-dimensional *model* of the actual racetrack and competing vehicles can be generated using the telemetry data and a commercially available personal computer racing simulation software package. Using the real-time telemetry

data . . . and *the racing simulation software*, a real-time *virtual reality* of the actual sporting event can be generated.
[Column 12, lines 7-13; emphasis added.]

Applicant respectfully submits that generating a virtual reality model of the actual sporting event based on telemetry information (e.g., which, according to Riggins at column 5, lines 8-10, may include the position and speed of the automobile) and on a racing simulation software package, as described by Riggins, does not teach or suggest that the telemetry data includes "GPS position information received from an imaging apparatus that is operable to acquire imaging area information concerning the corresponding program and is disposed mechanically independent of a movable body that is an object in the corresponding program," as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 2, 9, 12, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 45-47 and 49 are also believed to be patentable. Applicants further submit that Yuen, individually or in combination with Riggins, does not remedy the deficiencies described hereinabove with respect to claim 1, and thus with respect to the other independent claims as well.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentable and the application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request early reconsideration and allowance of the application. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's consideration of this matter, and the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone on any outstanding issue regarding the application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800